DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 422 291 SP 038 081

AUTHOR Jacobs, Richard M.
TITLE Teaching and Learning in the Studio of Instructional Leadership.
PUB DATE 1998-04-13
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Diego, CA, April 13-17, 1998).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrators; Adult Learning; College Faculty; Constructivism (Learning); Curriculum Development; Democratic Values; *Educational Administration; Graduate Students; Graduate Study; Higher Education; *Instructional Leadership; *Leadership Training; Learning Theories; *Reflective Teaching; Relevance (Education); Staff Development

ABSTRACT

This paper focuses on teaching and learning in educational administration and the challenges constructivism and reflective practice suggest for professors about their roles as teachers and learners. The paper takes four glimpses into a classroom (the studio of instructional leadership) where students seeking administrative certification learn the theoretical knowledge and technical skills associated with instructional leadership. The four glimpses are: conceptualizing democratic governance, examining alternative approaches to curriculum development, investigating and adopting adult learning theory, and designing a comprehensive staff development program. The glimpses show a professor using constructivist learning theory and reflective practice to make learning relevant to his students and to bridge the gap frequently demarcating theoretical knowledge and technical skills from practice. The four glimpses also show the professor constructing personal and professional knowledge about teaching and learning in educational administration. Before examining the studio of instructional leadership, the paper surveys the context for teaching and learning in the classroom and specifies students' learning objectives. The next section details what the students and the professor have learned. The paper closes by considering the challenges which the studio environment poses to teaching and learning in professional training programs. (Contains 62 references.) (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 422 291

Teaching and Learning in the Studio of Instructional Leadership

Richard M. Jacobs
VILLANOVA UNIVERSITY

A paper presented at the 1998 AERA TEA/SIG Symposium
"Using Constructivism and Reflective Practice
to Bridge the Theory/Practice Gap in Administrative Preparation"
(Session #13.22)

SP038081

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Jacobs

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

For most of the 20th century, descriptive theory—identifying what successful educational administrators do—and normative theory—suggesting what educational administrators ought to do to be successful—have predominated the landscape of educational administration research and practice (Griffiths, 1988; Wildman, 1997). While much of this research has yielded valuable insight into the phenomenon of educational administration and has provided the knowledge base used in training educational administrators, the topics of teaching and learning in educational administration have not received as much attention from researchers.

No doubt, professors teach and students learn in educational administration classrooms, perhaps a function of the disciplinary knowledge and expertise those who teach communicate to their students. However, when one views knowledge as a social construction (Vygotsky, 1978)—that is, knowledge is constructed and evolves as people interact and communicate—teaching and learning requires conceiving of the classroom as a forum where professors and students can interact, communicate, and collectively forge new understandings.

This paper takes four glimpses into a classroom—what the professor calls "the studio of instructional leadership"—where students seeking administrative certification learn the theoretical knowledge and technical skills associated with instructional leadership. On the surface, each glimpse shows a professor using constructivist learning theory (Krug, 1992; Lambert, 1997; Vygotsky, 1978) and reflective practice (Schön, 1991) to make learning relevant to his students as well as to bridge the gap frequently demarcating theoretical knowledge and technical skills from practice. The professor's ostensible goal is for students construct personal and professional meaning so that they will leave the studio capable of effecting school change through staff development (Starratt, 1993) and constructivist leadership (Lambert, Kent, Richert, Collay, & Dietz, 1997).

Taken as an aggregate, the four glimpses into the studio of instructional leadership also show the professor constructing personal and professional knowledge about teaching and learning in educational administration. In this forum wherein the professor works with the tools of his craft, he is not only cultivating his students' minds, that is, how they think about instructional leadership. More importantly, as the professor is also empowering his students to give voice to their learning, the professor also constructs the conceptual and experiential foundation he uses to evaluate his performance with regard to the two domains of his craft, namely, to communicate the theoretical knowledge and technical skills of the craft—the *teaching* domain—and to discern how best to achieve this goal, given the diversity of individuals and the resources available—the *learning* domain.

---

* - I am indebted to three colleagues who provided editorial guidance to focus the content of this paper: Ira Bogotch (University of New Orleans), Ed Pajak (University of Georgia), and Karen Osterman (Hofstra University).

Before glimpsing into the studio of instructional leadership, this paper surveys the context for teaching and learning in the studio of instructional leadership and then specifies the students' learning objectives. This survey provides a conceptual orientation to the body of this paper, that is, the four glimpses into the studio of instructional leadership. After taking these four glimpses, the third section details what the students and professor have learned. This paper closes by considering some challenges which the studio environment poses to teaching and learning in professional training programs. The principal focus of this paper, then, is the broad topic of teaching and learning in educational administration and the challenges constructivism and reflective practice suggest for professors about their roles as teachers and learners.

The context for teaching in the studio of instructional leadership...

Schön's (1991) *Educating the Reflective Practitioner* challenges those who teach practical arts—like architecture and, it is asserted here, educational administration—to alter how they conceive of their classrooms. Specifically, Schön proposes a metaphorical shift, from classroom to studio, which, in turn, requires a substantive change in classroom communication. That is, unidirectional communication—the "teaching as telling" model that is not sufficient to assure understanding (Fisher, 1978)—yields in the studio of instructional leadership to a reciprocal process of reflection and dialectical discourse—the "teaching as transactional" model (Miller, 1980).

For Miller, communication is a "transactional, symbolic process which allows people to relate to and manage their environments by 1) establishing human contact, 2) exchanging information, 3) reinforcing the attitudes and behaviors of others, and 4) changing the attitudes and behaviors of others (1980, p. 4). In the studio environment, for example, transactional communication is evident when professors and student influence and are influenced by one another through their communications. While transactional communication does not replace *complementary* behaviors—professors sharing with students expert knowledge and wisdom honed through experience—transactional communication does require that professors and students also engage in *symmetrical* behaviors—professors and students learning from one another (Watzlawick, Beavin, & Jackson, 1967). Thus, as participants' roles evolve over time, the studio environment will evidence professors teaching and students learning while, at other times, students will be teaching and professors will be learning. Transactional communication emphasizes this reciprocal process of interaction and communication where professors and students construct meaning from the resources available and translate that meaning into action.

In the studio of instructional leadership, transactional communication provides the medium for students to reflect upon the theoretical knowledge and technical skills associated with instructional leadership, to think about using them (given each student's unique talents, limitations, and professional experience), and to construct a theory for practice. In addition, transactional communication provides the medium for the professor

to learn whether and how he is promoting course objectives while, at the same time, constructing meaning with regard to his role as a facilitator of learning—both for the students and himself. In the studio of instructional leadership, transactional communication and symmetrical behaviors are focal—not only because these promote the reflective interaction necessary for participants to engage in dialectical discourse (Roby, 1988) but, more significantly, because the ability to engage one's fellow citizens in transactional communication and to persuade them to understand one's point-of-view is substance of politics in a democratic society (Dewey, 1916/1944).

The context for learning in the studio of instructional leadership...

"Instructional Evaluation and Staff Development" (IESD) is a foundational course in the School Leadership Program at Villanova University where veteran teachers seeking administrative certification assay their professional experience against research in curriculum, philosophy, and perspectives about teacher learning. In addition, students explore the paradox of supervising curriculum and instruction in schools whose purpose is to form citizens for a democratic republic. Finally, IESD complicates how students think about these issues as well as how students might to lead a community of educators to improve instruction through staff development (Starratt, 1993).

Given the teaching domain of the professoriate, the professor's primary goal in the studio of instructional leadership is that students acquire expertise in using the theoretical knowledge and technical skills integrated in the studio to promote teacher learning in schools. At the same time, the professor is interested that his students acquire a refined capacity to exercise vigilance against temptations to use authority in an autocratic, manipulative, arbitrary, or coercive manner.

Furthermore, given the learning domain of the professoriate, the professor is interested in perfecting his ability to engage his students in giving voice to their learning. At the same time, the professor wants to conduct valid self-evaluation of his work in the studio—throughout the course—concerning whether he is achieving his teaching and learning objectives and, if not, to implement strategies that will.

Learning objectives for the studio of instructional leadership...

If aspiring instructional leaders are to be effective, research suggests there is much they will need to know and to understand about curriculum and instruction, teacher learning, staff development, and leadership (Murphy, 1990; Terry, 1997). In addition, aspiring instructional leaders will need to recognize that, even though instructional leaders solve problems in different ways, research indicates that their primary work is forging a shared commitment to specific instructional goals, priorities, assessments, and procedures (Leithwood & Stager, 1986). Finally, aspiring instructional leaders need to learn how to provide the guidance, support, and encouragement that teachers need to be effective

(Blumberg, 1989; Crisci, 1986; Holcomb & McCue, 1991; Levine & Lezotte, 1990; Rowan, Bossert, & Dwyer, 1983).

IESD promotes these learning objectives by involving the students and professor in seven activities:

- to conceptualize democratic governance (Simon, 1951/1993)—the theoretical foundation of the American political system;
- to identify and to reflect on one's educational platform (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1988)—the beliefs, assumptions, and values guiding one's educational decision-making;
- to examine diverse approaches to curriculum development (Tyler, 1949; Henderson & Hawthorne, 1995)—the focus of instructional leadership;
- to investigate adult learning theory (Boone, 1985/1992; Knowles, 1988)—a theoretical foundation for educating adults;
- to explore school culture (Sergiovanni, 1995)—the implicit norms governing "the way we do things around here";
- to focus on character (Aristotle, 1958)—the basis of ethical practice; and,
- to design a comprehensive staff development program—the means to improve the technology of schooling.

Although these activities are listed in the order which the professor introduces them to IESD students, the acquisition and integration of the knowledge and skills associated with these seven activities is not nearly so a tidy process. As participants in the studio give voice to their learning, the artificial boundaries demarcating concepts become more permeable and elastic as theory, knowledge, skill, and experience are brought to bear in conversation. Out of this messiness, however, participants make learning relevant to their purposes.

Four glimpses into the studio of instructional leadership...

Four of the activities (to conceptualize democratic governance, to examine alternative approaches to curriculum development, to investigate adult learning theory, and to design a comprehensive development for professional development) provide windows for taking a glimpse into the studio of instructional leadership. After taking four glimpses, this paper will then consider how constructivism and reflective practice promote student learning in the studio of instructional leadership as well as what constructivism and reflective practice suggest for teaching and learning in educational administration.

Glimpse #1: **Conceptualizing democratic governance**

Most students come to IESD limited in their ability to articulate a substantive and convincing conceptualization of democratic political theory. Yes, students tacitly accept the importance of democratic political theory and can identify one or two substantive

principles—normally those learned in a junior high school civics course (e.g., the right to franchise; majority rule; protection of minority rights; civilized discourse and persuasion to effect political change). But, when pressed to identify what these principles imply in actual practice (e.g., the permissible limits for dissent) and to defend their rationale, students ventilate their frustration, oftentimes wondering aloud what this topic has to do with instructional leadership. Some even dismiss this conversation—mostly through nonverbal signals—as irrelevant to their interests and needs.

Perhaps this frustration stems from the students' inability to articulate, in a comprehensive and convincing manner, the fundamental notions of democratic theory and their implications for schools—those social organizations created by the community to inculcate in youth the fundamental rights and responsibilities associated with citizenship in a democratic society (Carnoy & Levin, 1985). Or, frustration may stem from embarrassment over the fact that the students really have not grasped a thorough understanding about the political theory animating the national community. And yet, if the women and men participating in the studio of instructional leadership are to lead the work of reforming curriculum and instruction in the nation's schools, the professor wonders, "How will they exercise instructional leadership if they are not able to articulate and to enact the purpose for which schools exist in the first place?"

IESD students study Simon's (1951/1993) philosophy of democratic governance as an analytic framework for conceiving of authority in a democracy, especially as authority manifests itself in its functions, namely:

- that authority aims at the proper good of the governed—in schools, the proper good is that students receive the very best educational program;
- that authority is not essential but substitutional, made necessary by a deficiency in the community—instructional leadership is necessary only to the degree that teacher self-interest and group self-interest do not allow the common good to transcend their decision making; and,
- that authority is pedagogical and ultimately aims at its own disappearance—instructional leadership is no longer necessary when the community of teachers allows the common good to transcend their decision making.

Initial communicative transactions about authority focus on the students' difficulty in translating Simon's abstract political theory into concrete educational practices. Taking this cue, the professor assumes complementary behavior to clarify a two-pronged theory of instructional leadership. That is, assuming that schools and the educators in them seek to effect a good and are also concerned with advancing that good—the *common* good—the professors tells students that instructional leaders are present in and exercise authority in schools for two basic reasons: primarily, in order that the community of teachers be directed toward the common good; and secondarily, in order that all functional aspects of schooling are support that end. When educators achieve these goals, the professor tells

his students, authority is possessed—not by an individual, nominally called the "leader"—but by the community, that is, the self-governing community of educators.

This theory of instructional leadership asserts that the instructional leader is the sole individual in the school specialized to keep in mind the entire common good, that point-of-view which must prevail over each of the goods envisioned by the local community as well as individual (and groups of) educators. It is this macro-level perspective—what Vaill (1986) calls "purpose"—that makes it possible for instructional leaders to exercise authority and to challenge others to allow the common good to transcend parochial self-interest. For Simon, this is the most essential authority (1951/1993, p. 59) and, without its exercise, the common good could be superseded by rational, calculative self-interest (Weber, 1930/1992). Ultimately, the professor reminds his students, schools would be rendered incapable of functioning as democratic communities as individuals and coalitions vie to effect self-interest through the shrewd use of power. Domination and hegemony bedecked in any disguise—whether by the majority usurping minority rights or the minority tyrannizing majority rule—stand in fundamental opposition to democracy. The exercise of authority is necessary for the community to steadfastly oppose these and other threats.

Since the instructional leader's authority is tested as that individual engenders, nurtures, and presides over communion-causing communications (Simon, 1951/1993, p. 66), this theory of instructional leadership mandates further study, understanding of, and proficiency in school communication (Jacobs, 1993). In particular, IESD students learn—to their astonishment—that the instructional leader's ability to persuade and to use mild forms of propaganda are essential tools in forging a democratic consensus. As paradoxical as this may seem, practicing instructional leaders must know, understand, and be capable of using persuasion and propaganda wisely, if instructional leaders are to enlist others in forging a majoritarian consensus and overcome a host of contentious issues.

As IESD students begin framing an operative understanding of democratic theory and its implications for the exercise of authority within schools, they are somewhat reflective—that is, guarded in expressing their ideas. However, for the professor, the momentary pause evident in these communicative transactions signifies an advance: IESD students are engaging their higher-order metacognitive capacities. And, if the professor can motivate his students to become more comfortable in negotiating the craggy terrain demarcating democratic political theory and discussing it, they will be able to relate abstract theoretical perspectives to their experience in schools.

The professor's instruction has yielded some success evidences as flashes of insight are quickened and IESD students enact more symmetrical behaviors. They begin to debate the hegemony exercised by their school's culture, the curriculum, the principal and administration, the teachers' union, parents, and so forth. One student interjects that his principal has decided to build collegiality among teachers through a year-long in-service

program. "It's a joke," he says, adding, "If we'd take a vote, he'd find that most of us aren't interested in collegiality. We'd rather be left alone."

At this point, the professor intervenes to shift the direction of the students' communicative transactions. In light of the students' understanding about democratic theory, the professor challenges them to evaluate more critically *their* ideas about managing schools and educating youth. "As a teacher, do you really want to be left alone? Or, have you learned that survival requires being a loner? In your school is there any relatedness characterizing a community?" (Lieberman & Miller, 1991; Lortie, 1977). IESD students respond to these questions, bemoaning the lack of collegiality and friendship in their schools—able to cite only a few instances of each. The professor asserts that colleagues—much like friends, families, and communities—share a common vision and mutual purposes. But, where colleagueship is absent, he adds, authority is necessary so that people possessing diverse interests and needs as well as varying degrees of power and access to limited resources can forge a common vision and specify mutual purposes.

While most IESD students tacitly accept the professor's assertion, their nonverbal communication suggest they are not convinced. The professor silently wonders what his students are learning. He thinks: "Yes, I have framed a context for learning." Namely, he has attempted: to evoke potential in a trusting environment; to reconstruct old assumptions and myths; to focus on the construction of meaning; and, to frame actions that embody new behaviors and purposeful actions (Lambert, 1997). But, to this point, the professor is aware that behavior in the studio of instructional leadership is more complementary than symmetrical (Watzlawick, *et al.*, 1967) and the communicative transactions give scant evidence of the type of dialectical discourse that promotes constructivist learning (Roby, 1988).

Glimpse #2:	**Examining alternative approaches to curriculum development**

IESD students are not just graduate students. They also are full-time teachers who must scramble to free up some time in their busy schedule if they are to prepare for class by reading two books that introduce them to two contested issues in instructional leadership. The first book, Tyler's *Principles of Curriculum and Instruction* (1949), represents the era when educational theorists busied themselves using the scientific method and research to resolve thorny educational issues. The second book, Henderson and Hawthorne's *Transformative Curriculum Leadership* (1995), represents a postmodern attempt to resolve these issues by using constructivism. The professor selected these books not because they represent opposing views about controversial issues; rather, the books were selected because their approaches to curriculum development and instructional evaluation stand in dialectical opposition.

Tyler's rationale provokes a predictable visceral reaction in students, for it is entirely too easy to view his structural approach as too constraining, overly time-consuming, and impractical for use and to neglect how Tyler conceptualizes the genesis of curriculum development. For example, Tyler does not suggest that the community of educators initiate curriculum development by consulting educational experts, university professors, governmental agencies, and politicians or by leaving it to principals, instructional leaders, faculty meetings, or the *ad hoc* decisions of classroom teachers. Rather, his process originates as *teachers* engage in action research—by leaving their schools and entering into the local community to gather relevant megatrends and demographics, to consult with and survey the local community about their attitudes, interests, and ideas, as well as to engage the local community in focused discussion about the learning experiences schools should provide youth. For Tyler, this research makes it possible for the community of teachers—as trained professionals—to forge a consensus not only about what their school will provide students but also to define evaluative standards. Tyler's rationale is far more democratic in its genesis than many of his critics or IESD students allow.

In contrast, IESD students are animated when they converse about Henderson and Hawthorne's text. Something about constructivism sparks their intrinsic interest. For example, the students express enthusiasm as they discuss learning as integrating prior experience and knowledge. They also express enthusiasm about the constructivist agenda that endeavors to liberate teachers from the straight-jacket of district-wide objectives, teacher-proofed curricula, and instructional packages. IESD students also resonate with the notion of entrusting greater latitude to teachers and students for making decisions about what are or are not appropriate learning objectives and pedagogical methods within their classrooms. And, IESD students are especially enamored with the notion of schools functioning—for teachers as well as students—as democratic learning communities.

Because the IESD students' symmetrical behavior in the studio of instructional leadership reveals a band of zealots who believe they have happened upon the Holy Grail, the professor gently proposes that they—like much contemporary curriculum inquiry—are not as solicitous to Tyler and his rationale as they might be. Introducing dialectical discourse into the students' communicative transactions, the professor submits that the students' affinity to constructivism is something they should also question.

While IESD students listen politely, they flip quickly through Tyler's first chapters, perusing them as if to disprove the professor's assertions and to defend themselves and their assessment of constructivism. Student discourse turns on the notions of external agents and agencies defining curriculum and assessing it (and thus "deprofessionalizing" educators), the need for principals—not teachers—to be more proactive within the community (forming a coalition to support the school and its goals), and re-engineering schooling to provide teachers the resources—especially time—they need to engage in a comprehensive program of curriculum development and evaluation of instruction.

When the students' search fails to disprove the professor's contention, the students appear disconcerted, if not embarrassed, for they have neither read nor considered Tyler carefully. And, as student discourse returns to Henderson and Hawthorne's work, one IESD student inquires, "Doesn't this model impose what teachers want upon the local community?" This student implies that rhetoric about forming democratic learning communities exposes an anti-democratic ideology if only because the rhetoric excludes the local community—the majority—from exercising its franchise in defining what its schools are to be. Suddenly, what IESD students found most attractive about constructivist theory, that is, its purported grounding in democratic theory and values, comes under assault. Vigorous debate, punctuated with passion, ensues as the students forge a synthesis between Tyler and Henderson and Hawthorne.

Student discourse reflects very practical realities as IESD students argue against allowing the local community to dictate what youth should learn in schools, citing numerous examples where this has exacerbated school-community relations. Examples cited include: phonics; sex education curricula; religion in the schools; character education; creationism; Ebonics; and basal readers. Other students assert the threat posed to educators by allowing the local community to make educational decisions. These students ask: "How is teaching a profession if all educators are supposed to do is to follow the community's dictates?" A minority of IESD students assert that having students make decisions about what they should be learning, while theoretically acceptable, would be absurd in practice.

At this point, IESD students interject what they perceive to be a lack of appropriate focus in public discourse about education. Specifically, politically active minority groups (e.g., atheists, conservative Christians, parents with problem children) have sought to gerrymander curriculum and instruction and, by so doing, have usurped educators of their prerogative to make professional judgments. As passions reach a crescendo, the professor prods IESD students by inquiring: "Is this why discourse about democratic learning communities and constructivism is so appealing—because teachers want to insulate and protect themselves from the dealing with the community?"

This question stokes the smoldering embers, as the students debate the reform proposal set forth by Henderson and Hawthorne. Some students defend the concepts of "democratic learning communities" and "constructivism" while others wonder whether they are clichés, propagandizing teachers to operate in isolation from and to foist their views upon students, all the while creating parochial jargon not professional discourse that few outside their clique understand. "Have Henderson and Hawthorne ever taught in a public school?" one student asks. Other IESD students develop a synthesis, suggesting that just as Tyler's rationale emphasized involving the local community in framing educational policy but overlooked the practicalities concerning how educators would implement the rationale in practice given many organizational constraints, so too, Henderson and Hawthorne provide insight into how teachers may engage in curriculum

development and instructional evaluation within the school yet have excluded the local community educational from decision making.

Knowing that IESD students would have a very difficult time functioning in the type of postmodern democratic school community proposed by Aronowitz and Giroux (1991) and contemplating whether they understand the exercise of authority in a democracy, the professor wonders to himself whether the students really have learned anything about democratic theory. However, there is a glimmer of hope as IESD students make connections between democratic theory and these contested educational issues. "We need to recall that the exercise of authority—focusing on the common good—differs from authoritarianism—dictating to others what will be done," the professor asserts.

Glimpse #3: **Investigating and adopting adult learning theory**

In contrast to their unsophisticated understanding of democratic theory, curriculum development, and instructional evaluation, IESD students come to the studio of instructional leadership experienced in and quite familiar with various pedagogical methods, and most especially, the traditional lecture-and-question format. The professor tells the students that what he finds interesting is not so much that students report this pedagogical method predominating schooling—even graduate schooling—but this unidirectional mode of school communication characterized by complementary behavior pervades staff development programs.

When IESD students first encounter andragogy and its assumptions (Boone, 1985/1992; Knowles, 1988), they exhibit keen interest. The students are more animated and expressive than their initial encounter with democratic theory, especially as andragogy irritates a raw nerve and stirs memories of failed staff development programs. It is at this critical juncture that the professor enjoins IESD students to relate these experiences to instructional leadership by shifting their conversation away from "war stories" toward a critical analysis of the beliefs, assumptions, and values that undergird failed programs. His intention is to elevate their communicative transactions beyond escapist, therapeutic, commonsense, technical-procedural, or ameliorative conversation and toward critical discourse, so that students will focus upon what is embedded in and at stake in educational decision making. As Beyer (1991) submits, reflecting critically upon experience enables teachers to construct meaning, to engage in shared inquiry, and to refine professional discourse.

In the studio of instructional leadership, where professor's expressed desire is for students to recognize the legitimacy of the instructional leader's authority and the potential hazards that come into play when instructional leaders enact behaviors intended to foster a democratic school culture, it is possible—if not probable—that IESD students—with every intention of being proactive about change by collaborating with individual teachers, faculty groups, and teacher leaders to identify, assess, and analyze

expressed/felt learning needs—could fall unwittingly into the trap of authoritarianism, that is, unilaterally imposing upon faculty a pre-determined agenda—one reflecting the instructional leader's ideology or an agenda that satisfies external agents, e.g., legislators, school board members, or district office planners. (Sometimes a student will interject this thought into discussion, providing a evidence that at least one student is bridging theory and skill with practice.) To alert IESD students to this trap, the professor hearkens back to Simon (1951/1993) and asks students to anticipate how instructional leaders might use persuasion and propaganda to shift the focus of attention away from what external figures determine teachers need—both individually and collectively—and to consider carefully what the actual situation is and what the teachers perceive themselves needing if they are to promote the common good and attain shared goals.

As the IESD students wrestle with these complex notions, one student articulates—in a gasp of exasperation—how intricately complex planning for school change and professional development really is, given its prerequisites. Reflecting Boone's (1985/1992) insight, the student asserts that *ad hoc* planning or planning based upon what outside interests assert are mistaken notions. Instead, students in the studio of instructional leadership converse about planning for school change and professional development in terms likening both to a deliberate, rational, continuing sequence of purposeful activities through which the instructional leader crafts a school culture wherein teachers acquire a more thorough understanding of, commitment to, and participation in the school's functions, structure, and processes.

It is also not unusual for the students' communicative transactions to reflect upon their experience—bridging theory and skill with practice—by providing examples of principals who have endeavored to foster faculty competence through other means, for example, by bartering with teachers, forming coalitions, seizing upon events to bond faculty or, in some cases, coercing participation. However, as these conversations devolve once again into the sharing of war stories, each illuminating a failure of authority, the professor intervenes to focus the direction of the students' communicative transactions, challenging IESD students to identify the theories-in-use embedded in failed attempts to improve curriculum and instruction. In addition, the professor challenges students to identify what they perceive principals needing if they are to avoid the snares threatening to foil their initiatives.

IESD students typically do not respond directly to these challenges. Instead, the students proffer the generalization that principals are, for the most part, unwilling to listen to teachers. Some students assume responsibility for the direction of their conversation and move discourse beyond this impasse, using Boone (1985/1992) to support the assertion that program developers need to be attentive to and to reflect upon what their constituents are saying, that is, to engage individual teachers, groups of teachers, and the entire faculty in discourse about their needs. The students also add that instructional leaders also need to examine whether and to what degree they are fostering an environment conducive to professional development, especially by engaging in the

self-change and self-renewal necessary to overcome one's deficiencies and so, to model professional growth and development to teachers. "There's nothing worse than a hypocrite," asserts a student, "who tells teachers what to do while doing just what he told the teachers not to do."

Reflecting on his students' assertions, the professor experiences self-satisfaction. For, although the students have not responded directly to his challenges, their communicative transactions indicate that some IESD students are beginning to grasp how important it is for instructional leaders to engage with their teachers in symmetrical behavior (Watzlawick *et al.*, 1967). Furthermore, as IESD students describe the instructional leader's primary challenge as one of fostering a climate where inquiry into practice where learning from mistakes is permissible (e.g., the school as "mistake center," Nyquist, 1977), the professor recognizes that IESD students thinking about how instructional leaders encourage teachers to overcome defensive barriers to learning (Senge, 1990). Unbeknownst to them, IESD students are looking to the common good to inform decision making. Finally, they are professionalizing their discourse and, in this instance, conversation in the studio of instructional leadership reflects Firestone and Wilson's (1985) insight that successful instructional leaders use bureaucratic and cultural linkages to improve instruction. IESD students are beginning to construct a relevant theory of practice to guide their decision making. One day and with greater experience, many of the students' ideas will be transformed into personal and professional skills and expertise as they work with the materials of their craft, first constructed in the studio of instructional leadership.

At the same time, the professor recognizes that behavior changes dramatically in the studio of instructional leadership. At times, the professor enacts complementary behaviors—for example, as he teaches students—and, at other times, he enacts symmetrical behaviors—for example, as he and IESD students engage in discourse about topics. Likewise, IESD students enact complementary behaviors—for example, as they teach the professor about their experience in schools and as the professor learns from his students what they are learning in the studio of instructional leadership—and, at other times, IESD students enact complementary behaviors—for example, as they introduce topics into discourse that require the professor to share his thinking, experience, and what he is learning with his students. It is this constantly shifting terrain that the professor recognizes—the behaviors enacted in the studio—that differentiates teaching and learning in the studio environment from the traditional classroom.

Glimpse #4:	**Designing a Comprehensive Staff Development Program**

During the second half of the course, IESD students integrate the theories and skills they are learning—to practice their conceptions of the craft—by designing a comprehensive staff development program for their schools. This is a simulation, to be sure. At the same time, however, this exercise provides IESD students an opportunity to

structure their nascent ideas and to test them in the studio of instructional leadership—without negligibly impacting their schools, teachers, or students. The question framing this segment of the course is, "What do teachers learn as they teach?" And, to respond to this question, IESD students study the "learning to teach" literature (Berliner, 1986; Carter, 1990; Kagan, 1992; Sternberg & Horvath, 1995).

The learning to teach literature piques student interest, as they discover researchers voicing the students' experiences when they first learned to teach. Given the differing levels of professional development present in the studio of instructional leadership, students resonate with the stages of "teacher learning" they have confronted and surpassed. At the same time, the literature makes it possible for students to envision a trajectory of professional learning and the challenges yet awaiting them.

In their communicative transactions, IESD students note how the learning to teach literature contradicts an implicit ideology guiding them and many of their colleagues. Namely, that as trained professionals, teachers—even novice teachers—know precisely what to do and, when they confront the messy thicket of problems in their classrooms, can prescribe the precise antidote to ameliorate the symptoms. For educators imprisoned in this ideological iron cage, errors in judgment must be privatized and kept secret at all cost. IESD students assert that embarrassment ensues if anyone—especially a supervisor—should seize upon a failure and note it in an assessment of teaching effectiveness (Lieberman & Miller, 1991; Lortie, 1977).

For the professor, this conversation provides an indication that IESD students, as they reflect upon and express mistakes they have made in learning to teach, are gradually exposing themselves and their professional development to critical scrutiny. "Perhaps," the professor asserts, "your mistakes are the evidence of your own professional growth and the accumulation of practical wisdom." In light of these subjective issues, the professor invites his students to envision what a staff development program ought to endeavor to achieve and how it might be organized to meet teachers' learning needs (Tiezzi, 1991, pp. 319-24).

The comprehensive staff development project is the course's culminating exercise providing IESD students the opportunity to apply what they are learning about instructional leadership and staff development to actual practice in their schools. The packet informs IESD students that, while staff development is directed at the process of teacher change (Guskey, 1986), it must also account for differences between novice, proficient, and expert teachers (Berliner, 1986) and, by focusing on teachers' knowledge of their craft (Carter, 1990), the staff development program must engage faculty in forming a collegial culture wherein more proficient and expert teachers function as instructional leaders for their novice and proficient colleagues. In sum, IESD students will design a comprehensive staff development program for their schools so that teachers—at all levels of professional maturation—can engage in appropriate continuous professional learning, a type of "situated knowledge" (Brown, Collins, & Duguid, 1989) directed

toward healing the fissure evidencing itself between pre-service teacher education and actual practice during teachers' first five years in the classroom (Kagan, 1992) and provide continuous staff development for veteran teachers. The product of the students' efforts will be an "instructional leadership portfolio" demonstrating mastery in applying the theories and skills.

Five discrete assignments comprise the comprehensive staff development project:

1. To Conduct a Literature Review and To Construct a Staff Development Bibliography
2. To Frame a Program for Staff Development
3. To Specify the Instructional Leader's Focus
4. To Apply Research for Teacher Growth and Development
5. To Anticipate and To Address Potential Problems

After students receive the packet describing the project, they proceed to the library, where they work together, oftentimes chit-chatting as much about the research articles they are gathering as they do about class, the amount of work they are expected to complete, and their work day. From the professor's view, it is interesting to note how, once students identify what they believe is a good article and then read it to decide whether to include it in their portfolio, they will talk with one another about the article's contents. While some of this conversation focuses initially on the question, "Do you think he will accept it?" As they push conversation further, IESD students critique whether the findings are supported by the evidence reported and congruent with their experience.

The following week, when IESD students hand in the first assignment, they report being overwhelmed by the sheer volume of literature available. They also report puzzlement at the wide variety of literature, correctly pointing out that much of it is quasi-research. The students also express their collective opinion that summaries of the research provided in periodicals, like *Educational Leadership and Phi Delta Kappan*, are more "user friendly" to busy professionals than are more rigorous journals, like *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *American Educational Research Journal*, and *Educational Researcher*. However, they also note, the findings reported in summaries oftentimes mask spurious research.

Much of what students write for the second assignment is a succinct summary of the conceptual ideas examined in the studio of instructional leadership. At the same time, students express their ideas concerning staff development and teacher learning with greater clarity and conviction as well as with an awareness of the challenges democratic theory presents. Finally, most students exceed the single page limitation, complaining that what needs to be said cannot be contained on one page. However, the professor's goal is that students be concise, precise, and clear in their assertions, scripting an initial instructional leadership platform.

The third assignment tests the degree to which andragogy and democratic theory influence the students' vision of instructional leadership. While they are asked to define what teachers should be learning, the actual test is whether students actually engage in conversation with teachers in their schools about the challenges they are confronting in their classrooms and what they might need to grow and develop professionally. Despotism can be seductive, especially for professionals, and it is not unusual for IESD students to proceed merrily along the pathway of authoritarianism as they define what they want teachers to learn while neglecting to involve teachers in the process of identifying and clarifying their professional needs. However, this erroneous judgment provides an important learning—and, when pointed out in the studio of instructional leadership—is one the students will not forget. Furthermore, this learning demonstrates the efficacy of providing professional training in the studio of instructional leadership. Here, when errors are made, they do not negatively impact human beings in schools.

Thus, the general purpose of the third assignment is to challenge IESD students to identify what they, as instructional leaders, would use to evaluate whether and to what degree they are achieving their goals. More subtly, however, the assignment also challenges students to focus upon what they are learning as they lead staff development in their schools. The purpose for this shift, from "teacher learning" to "leader learning," is to practice IESD students in soliciting from others their ideas concerning whether, if, and how to better achieve defined programmatic goals. At the same time, this shift also reminds students that, as instructional leaders, they are accountable for achieving educational goals. Finally, the portfolio's third division provides data for other interested parties (e.g., principals and district superintendents) to evaluate the program and the instructional leader as well.

The fourth assignment pushes IESD students to conceptualize the complexities for staff development implicit in the learning to teach literature. That is, there will be differing needs for staff development in any school depending upon the levels of professional growth achieved by individual teachers. And, at the same time, the instructional leader has specified learning goals that apply to the entire community of teachers in the school.

To organize these complex goals in a manageable format, students design a matrix summarizing the learning specified for each level of professional growth. The matrix is the heart of the project, representing the learning goals identified by the teachers as necessary to promote the common good as well as the specific objectives that will be used for evaluation at each level of teacher learning. For those who may be interested in delving more deeply into why individual learning experiences are included in the comprehensive staff development program, supportive documentation is appended to the matrix.

Frequently, unanticipated problems do arise as staff development programs are implemented and, as these problems arise, instructional leaders must deal effectively with them. The fifth assignment asks IESD students to be proactive by anticipating factors that may inhibit successful implementation of the program. Over time and with experience,

success will provide the instructional leader a comprehensive awareness of the problems implicit in designing and implementing professional development programs as well as an array of resolutions for dealing with problems. The ability to offer multiple resolutions for a variety of contexts, then, provides evidence of increasing leadership expertise (Bolman & Deal, 1991; Morgan, 1986).

The completed portfolios reflect, for the most part, a high degree of professional awareness—not only the theories and skills that instructional leaders need to guide a successful staff development program but also the threats to success. For many—if not all—IESD students, the portfolio is as much a personal statement as a professional achievement—an educational product not only representing what they believe in and stand for but also how they would provide instructional leadership. Indeed, the completed projects are something IESD students can be proud of and use in the future to demonstrate—when, for example, interviewing for an administrative position—how they think about and envision exercising instructional leadership.

For the professor, the projects provide a bountiful resource to evaluate how IESD students have grappled with the learning objectives specified for the studio of instructional leadership. For the most part, the projects are well-written, visually attractive, and professional. The portfolios also exhibit sophisticated levels of thought and carefully crafted prose. And, for the most part, there is little to critique, for the portfolios include research justifications supporting the programmatic elements. More importantly, though, the portfolios provide the professor data to evaluate his success in shaping how these aspiring instructional leaders think about and will practice and evaluate their work.

Teaching and learning in the studio of instructional leadership...

These four glimpses into the studio of instructional leadership show a professor using constructivist thought (Krug, 1992; Lambert, 1997; Vygotsky, 1978) and reflective practice (Schön, 1991) to craft a learning environment where his students engage in transactional communication (Miller, 1980) about the theories and skills related to instructional leadership practice. These conceptual tools enable participants in the studio of instructional leadership to bridge the gap oftentimes separating theory from practice—making theory relevant to practice—and, by engaging in a reciprocal communicative process, to shape how to conceive of practice.

In light of these goals, what do IESD students identify as having learned in the studio of instructional leadership? The students' staff development portfolios offer three broad areas of learning.

First: *instructional leadership involves altering or changing, through planned programming, teachers' behavioral patterns to the extent that teachers are better equipped to cope with and to adapt to change.*

Like Tiezzi (1991)—who asserts that if teachers are to learn about their craft, they need to reconceptualize what they are enacting in their classrooms by examining other possibilities and making sense out of what they are learning—IESD students assert that teachers need to develop a clear awareness concerning "what is" and to test this against "what ought to be." The issue, IESD students maintain, is for teachers get outside of and beyond the mundane (and sometimes depressing) reality of their experience and to envision possibilities about what could be—were an optimistic vision to frame the agenda for school change through staff development.

IESD students identify a first step in this direction—that is, to develop a shared vision about what could be—by having instructional leaders engage teachers in formulating their educational platforms (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1988). Then, after these managerial and educational ideals explicit, IESD student suggest that instructional leaders facilitate faculty discussion about their ideals and involve the teachers in critiquing the positive and negative implications of these ideals. This activity, IESD students maintain, should stimulate some—if not many—teachers to reflect upon their own theories-in-practice. And, as individual teachers and groups of teacher experiment to improve practice, instructional leaders can work to forge greater consensus about a shared educational platform.

For the professor, the students' assertion assumes that teacher learning is facilitated in collaborative groups (Tiezzi, 1991) where symmetrical behavior (Watzlawick *et al.*, 1967), and transactional communication (Miller, 1980) predominate. These assumptions evidence IESD students integrating these theories into practice, at least in as far as IESD students currently envision it. Whether this integration will evidence itself in practice is an issue requiring the professor to conduct future research once IESD students become instructional leaders and hone their professional practice. The research problem, for the professor, is not if IESD students have directly applied what they learned in the studio of instructional leadership to actual practice but whether and to what degree the students have refined what they learned in the studio of instructional leadership as they have worked with the materials of their craft.

Second: *the instructional leader's knowledge and experience needs to be conjoined with the teachers' knowledge and experience.*

The students' portfolios suggest that instructional leaders have a particular kind of experience, expertise, and authority that teachers need to appreciate, and vice versa, for in a democratic school community both instructional leaders and teachers possess authority and have contributions to make to the planning process. IESD students envision instructional leaders not as a hierarchical superiors *per se*; rather, they view these individuals as teachers' colleagues whose function is to serve as resources programming for staff development and as facilitators to assist teachers to integrate and expand their professional learning.

As resources, IESD students envision instructional leaders using their expertise to identify the levels of professional growth achieved by individual teachers. Then, as facilitators, instructional leaders share their expertise by providing differentiated staff development programs for novice, proficient, and expert teachers, all the while endeavoring to build collegial relationships within and between teachers.

As the portfolios portray instructional leadership practice, students imply that symmetrical behavior—emphasizing continuous professional growth of both teachers and instructional leaders—should be normative. It is a matter of emphasis, though, because the projects also show instructional leaders remediating the professional deficits of unfit teachers—evidence that complementary behavior is and will characterize instructional leadership practice. Thus, IESD students disagree with Simon (1951/1993), asserting that although instructional leadership is pedagogical, the instructional leader's authority is not substitutional and aimed at effecting its dissolution by empowering the community of teachers, if only because IESD students believe that continuous learning characterizes the craft of teaching.

Third: *instructional leadership requires working with the local community to formulate broad educational goals so that the school's educational program represents the community's interest; at the same time, however, teachers possess the authority to translate educational goals into objectives and strategies.*

The students' projects evidence an awareness that schools and the teachers in them cannot insulate themselves from the civic community. This awareness signals a change because, early in the course, IESD students were hesitant about allowing outsiders to become involved in schools. Traces of this hesitancy are still present, however, as the students carefully distinguish in their portfolios between goals and how these are translated into objectives and strategies.

With respect to school-community relations, the students' portfolios liken instructional leaders to "mediators" whose responsibility is to provide responsive leadership (Caldwell & Spinks, 1992). In this role, instructional leaders appraise the local community about how teachers are responding to the community's goals while also appraising teachers about the local community's interests. In addition, as responsive leaders, instructional leaders program for staff development so that the community of teachers will be better equipped to translate the community's goals into objectives and strategies that will guide professional practice in the school. To effect these outcomes, IESD students suggest two tools: propaganda and persuasion, as Simon defines them (1951/1983).

Given these assertions, IESD students have learned to deal with some of the implications of democratic theory for schooling, in general, and teaching, in particular. They recognize the nature of authority in a democracy and the legitimate role of the civic community with regard to schooling, especially authority as pedagogical (Simon,

1951/1993). At the same time, IESD students preserve the legitimate role of teachers *qua* professionals in curriculum development and instructional evaluation. In theory, this third learning indicates that IESD students have successfully grappled with balancing the civic community's interest in schools and teacher professionalism. It will be in the crucible of practice that students will discover themselves becoming more concrete about how they will balance conflicting expectations and demands, for example, by being familiar with and using the bureaucratic and cultural linkages in the school structure to engage teachers and the local community in forging a majoritarian consensus.

In sum, the studio environment provides a rich environment within which IESD students developed a conception of instructional leadership practice that integrates both the theoretical knowledge and technical skills associated with effective instructional leaders. The students' portfolios evidence that they now possess a body of professional knowledge—theoretical conceptions and technical skills—tested against the students' experience. In addition, the design of the comprehensive staff development programs included in each portfolio represents an espoused theory of instructional leadership practice. Though experience will confirm and disconfirm some of these conceptions, the portfolios will serve as a benchmark against which each student, as a practicing instructional leader, will be able to evaluate future personal and professional growth and development.

IESD students, however, are not the only learners participating in the studio of instructional leadership. What learning does the studio environment stimulate for those who teach instructional leadership?

First: *the professor learns about graduate students—what they know and don't know, as well as their experience in schools, their tacit assumptions, beliefs, and experiences—as they grapple with the materials of the craft, themselves, the professor, and with one another.*

Because the studio environment is geared to learning a professional craft, knowing what the students are learning is paramount—for this information provides evidence for the professor to evaluate whether and to what degree course learning objectives are being promoted. As the professor fosters an environment where students give voice to their learning, he assists IESD students to overcome the defensive barriers to learning (Senge, 1990). As Argyris (1991) asserts, the trick involves how to teach smart people to learn in a way that expands their capacity to do the same not only with one another in the studio of instructional leadership but eventually with their colleagues in schools and fellow citizens in the civic community. From a constructivist perspective, however, the trick is not teaching smart people how to learn but stimulating their intrinsic interest in learning.

The primary issue concerns communication. Transactional communication (Miller, 1980) provides a useful model for the professor not only to envision communication with the studio of instructional leadership, but also to analyze the direction of communicative

transactions and to intervene in these transactions with the goal of promoting critical discourse so that students will focus upon what is embedded in and at stake in educational decision making. As the professor learns to direct the communicative transactions in the studio of instructional leadership, students will reflect more critically upon experience, to construct meaning, to engage in shared inquiry, and to refine professional discourse (Beyer, 1991).

Second: *as students give voice to their ideas and opinions, the professor also learns how to assist students—who possess an array of learning styles, personality temperaments, and interests—to construct a professional knowledge base of theories and skills that will make it possible for them to function more like craftsmen than functionaries.*

Although there are similarities among IESD students each semester, their diversity is more conspicuous. Over the course of semesters and years, a perceptive professor will learn to expand the repertoire of skills needed to deal effectively with these differences. But, it is improbable—simply due to the variability itself—that the professor will ever know infallibly what will motivate each and every student. Thus, for the professor, each semester involves learning anew how to motivate a diverse group students to consider the applicability of theoretical knowledge and technical skills to the practice of instructional leadership. Teaching in the studio, then, is more of a constructivist "work in progress" than a pedagogical "template" imposed upon malleable subjects.

Teaching in the studio of instructional leadership, then, does not simply involve communicating the theoretical knowledge or the skills associated with effective instructional leadership. Neither is teaching in instructional leadership identifying and studying promising practices. Teaching instructional leadership involves all of these...and more.

In light of this second learning, perhaps most importantly, teaching instructional leadership involves changing the professor's focus. In the studio, the professor's primary interest in and source for learning about teaching instructional leadership is each student and the ability for each student to make wise decisions about what ought to be done in schools to promote curriculum development and instructional evaluation through staff development. In this instance, the professor is learning that the subject he teaches is not the theories and skills associated with effective instructional leadership but more so students interested in becoming instructional leadership. This shift in focus—from *the course as subject* to *the student as subject*—requires professors to be expert not only in the theoretical knowledge and technical skills associated with the craft. More importantly, professors teaching in the studio must utilize what they learn as they teach their subjects to hone their facility in crafting their students minds and hearts to be better attuned to the complex issues arising in instructional leadership practice.

Third: *the studio environment challenges the professor's conceptions about learning.*

Somewhat naively, as IESD students struggle with the theoretical knowledge and technical skills associated with their craft and give voice to what they are learning as they apply it to their experience in schools, the professor learns that knowledge about the abstract theories and technical skills associated with the craft are not learned solely as students read assigned textbooks, listen to lectures about what they've already read, engage in writing term papers or projects, and pass examinations demonstrating mastery of course content. Rather, in the studio of instructional leadership, learning for the most part transpires through conversation as students puzzle through an amazing array of ideas, oftentimes testing them as much against their experience and ideals as against the professor's knowledge and expertise.

Moving away from didactic instruction to interactive conversation requires a leap of faith in one's self, one's students, and the studio itself, for conversation *per se* does not look like learning. However, transactional communication (Miller, 1980) challenges professors teaching in the studio of instructional leadership to respect their students and to expect that they will influence teaching and learning through conversation. The exchange of knowledge and meaning between professors and students develops as professors and students mutually affect and are affected by one another and as their behavior evolves. And, even though both complementary and symmetrical behavior is present in the studio of instructional leadership, professors and students change and are changed through their interactions in the studio and over time.

Fourth: *as conversation in the studio of instructional leadership stimulates student interest in and assuming ownership for one's learning, the professor learns that evaluation of student learning moves away from objective measures to more subjective measures.*

Evidence that IESD students are learning in the studio of instructional leadership emerges as they reveal their thinking—rightly or wrongly—as they apply theoretical conceptions and technical skills to conversations, exercises, and projects linking what students are learning in the studio of instructional leadership with their practical experience in schools. While the students' portfolios provides a great deal of descriptive evidence about what they have learned, the quality of student discourse provides qualitative evidence of their integration of theory and skill.

For professors who teach instructional leadership, Schön's metaphor of the studio aptly depicts how the graduate school classroom is uniquely positioned to provide training for students seeking to learn the craft of instructional leadership. Furthermore, this metaphor also depicts the type of graduate school learning environment wherein aspiring instructional leaders can integrate the theories, skills, and dispositions they will need to relate these theories, skills, and dispositions to actual practice. And finally, students are

not the only people learning in the studio; as professors engage in teaching, they also opens themselves to significant learning—about the professorial role.

Some challenges for teaching and learning in educational administration ...

Try as they might, professors of educational administration cannot avoid the rather embarrassing and painful finding uncovered by research spanning the course of the past three decades. In response to the inquiry, "Of what value was your training program to your professional practice?", graduates report that teaching and learning in educational administration programs is largely irrelevant to the complexities they confront in practice (Fowler, 1991; Goldman & Kempner, 1988; Haller, Brent, & McNamara, 1994; Hemphill, Griffiths, & Fredriksen, 1962; Maher, 1987; Schnur, 1989). A few dissent from this opinion—not surprisingly—those who earn doctorates in educational administration (Wildman, 1991).

It would seem that, if professors who teach educational administration are to make teaching and learning relevant to practice—what typically is called "bridging the theory-practice gap"—the four glimpses into the studio of instructional leadership suggest that professors must possess three capabilities.

First: professors need to be capable of engaging students in conversation about the broad array of theories and skills associated with practice so that students not only learn to use theory to inform skill but also vice-versa (Bridges, 1992; Murphy & Hallinger, 1989). Second: professors should possess the capacity to enable students to give voice to what they are learning—not only what they are learning about the theoretical and technical skills of their craft (Argyris & Schön, 1974) but about themselves, their professional experiences, the professor, and one another as well. Third: professors must be capable of building a culture of inquiry in the classroom (Brubacher, Case, & Reagan, 1994) so that students will possess the experiential background enabling them to build a culture of inquiry in the schools where they practice instructional leadership.

Supported in their teaching role by these three capabilities, professors teaching in the studio environment can utilize the tools of reflective practice—the ability to listen, to engage in self-revealing discourse, and to coach—to model behaviors that stimulate student interest in and taking responsibility for learning. In addition, professors teaching in the studio environment can utilize constructivist principles—evoking potential in a trusting environment through surfacing students' prior experiences, beliefs, assumptions, and perceptions; reconstructing, "breaking set" with, old assumption and myths through shared inquiry; focusing on the construction of meaning through shared dialogue; and, framing actions that embody new behaviors and purposeful intentions (Lambert, 1997, pp. 240-241)—to assist students integrate the theoretical perspectives and technical skills of their craft with practice.

Precisely because the studio environment requires involves interpersonal interaction and transactional communication, aspiring instructional leaders can learn the theories and skills associated with effective instructional evaluation and staff development in a way that is meaningful, if professors approach teaching and learning with sensitivity to those participating in the studio. This approach to teaching instructional leadership is unlike teaching planning, budgeting, or even the "one best way" approaches like site-based management and shared governance, which assume a context and personal dispositions that do not exist in many schools or, for that matter, in many graduate school classrooms.

Reconceiving the "classroom" as a "studio" offers a vision of a dynamic learning environment wherein professors who teach practical arts—like educational administration—to become more purposive about teaching and learning. By integrating constructivism (Krug, 1992; Lambert, 1997; Vygotsky, 1978) and reflective practice (Schön, 1991), professors of educational administration can hone communicative transactions (Miller, 1980) within the studio environment to develop each student's discursive capabilities and thus, to enable each student to be better capable not only of rendering informed and wise decisions but also of bearing responsibility for the exercise of authority in actual practice.

References

Argyris, C. (1991). Teaching smart people how to learn. *Harvard Business Review, 69*(3), 99-109.

Argyris, C., & Schön, D. A. (1974). *Theory in Practice: Increasing Professional Effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Aristotle. (1958). The Nicomachean ethics. In W. D. Ross (Trans.), *The pocket Aristotle* (pp. 158-274). New York: Simon & Schuster.

Aronowitz, S., & Giroux, H. A. (1991). *Postmodern education: Politics, culture, and social criticism*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Berliner, D. C. (1986). In pursuit of the expert pedagogue. *Educational Researcher, 15*(7), 5-13.

Beyer, L. E. (1991). Teacher education, reflective inquiry and moral action. In B. R. Tabachnich & K. M. Zeichner (Eds.), *Issues and practices in inquiry-oriented teacher education* (pp. 113-29). Bristol, PA: The Falmer Press.

Blumberg, A. (1989). *School administration as a craft: Foundations of practice*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1991). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Boone, E. J. (1985/1992). *Developing programs in adult education*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.

Bridges, E. A. (1992). *Problem-based learning for administrators*. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational management.

Brown, J., Collins, A., & Duguid, D. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational Researcher, 18*(1), 32-42.

Brubacher, J. W., Case, C. W., & Reagan, T. G. (1994). *Becoming a reflective educator: How to build a culture of inquiry in the schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Caldwell, B. J., & Spinks, J. M. (1992). *Leading the self-managing school*. Bristol, PA: The Falmer Press.

Carnoy, M., & Levin, H. (1985). *Schooling and work in the democratic state*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Carter, K. (1990). Teachers' knowledge and learning to teach. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 291-310). New York: Macmillan.

Crisci, P. E. (1986). *An achievement formula that applies the correlates of effective schools and the recommendations of the "excellence"* (ERIC ED 270 455). Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Dewey, J. (1916/1944). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: Free Press.

Firestone, W. A., & Wilson, B. L. (1985). Using bureaucratic and cultural linkages to improve instruction: The principal's contribution. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 21*(2), 7-30.

Fisher, B. A. (1978). *Perspectives on human communication*. New York: Macmillan.

Fowler, W. J., Jr. (1991). *What are the characteristics of principals viewed as effective by teachers?* (ERIC ED 347 675). Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Goldman, P., & Kempner, K. (1988). *The administrators view of professional training* (ERIC ED 325 979). Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Griffiths, D. E. (1988). Administrative theory. In N. Boyan (Ed.), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (pp. 27-51). New York: Longman.

Guskey, T. R. (1986). Staff development and the process of teacher change. *Educational Researcher, 15*(5), 5-12.

Haller, E. J., Brent, B. O., & McNamara, J. H. (1994, April). *Does graduate training in Educational Administration improve America's schools? Another look at some national data*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Hemphill, J. K., Griffiths, D. E., & Fredriksen, N. (1962). *Administrative performance and personality*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Henderson, J. G., & Hawthorne, R. D. (1995). *Transformative curriculum leadership*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Holcomb, E., & McCue, L. (1991). *A handbook for implementing school leadership* (ERIC ED 353 681). Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Jacobs, R. M. (1993). Road maps to navigate school communication. *Journal of Management Systems 5*(2), 1-14.

Kagan, D. M. (1992). Professional growth among preservice and beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research, 62*(2), 129-169.

Knowles, M. S. (1988). *The modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to andragogy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Cambridge Book Company.

Krug, S. E. (1992). Instructional leadership: A constructivist perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 28*(3), 430-443.

Lambert, L. (1997). Constructivist leadership defined. In L. Wildman (Ed.), *School administration: The new knowledge base* (pp. 238-246). Lancaster, PA: Technomic Publishing Company.

Lambert, L., Kent, K., Richert, A. E., Collay, M., & Dietz, M. (1997). *Who will save our schools? Teachers as constructivist leaders*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Leithwood, K. J., & Stager, M. (1986, April). *Differences in problem-solving processes used by moderately and highly effective principals*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Levine, D. U., & Lezotte, L. (1990). *Unusually effective schools: A review and analysis of research and practice* (ERIC ED 330 032). Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Lieberman, A., & Miller, A. (1991). *Teachers—their work and their world: Implications for school improvement*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Lortie, D. C. (1977). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Maher, R. E. (1987). *The training of educational administrators: Perceptions of building and central office administrators*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Fordham University.

Miller, G. R. (1980). Introduction to communication. In C. L. Book (Ed.), *Human communication: Principles, contexts, and skills* (pp. 4-37). New York: St. Martin's Press.

Morgan, G. (1986). *Images of organization*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Murphy, J. (1990). Principal instructional leadership. In P. W. Thurston & L. S. Lotto (Eds.), *Perspectives on the school. Advances in educational administration* (Volume 1, Part B, 163-200). Greenwich, CN: JAI Press Inc.

Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1989). A new era in the professional development of school administrators: Lessons from emerging programs. *Journal of Educational Administration, 27*, 22-45.

Nyquist, J. K. (Speaker). (1977). *How to lead a discussion* (videotape recording). Seattle, WA: University of Washington, Center for Instructional Development and Research.

Roby, T. W. (1988). Models of discussion. In J. T. Dillon (Ed.,) *Questioning and discussion: A multidisciplinary study* (pp. 163-191). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Rowan, B., Bossert, S. T., & Dwyer, D. C. (1983, April). Research on effective schools: A cautionary note. *Educational Researcher, 12*(4), 24-31.

Schnur, S. I. (1989). *The training of educational administrators: Perceptions of building principals*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Fordham University.

Schön, D. A. (1991). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco: Josseÿ-Bass.

Senge, P. M. (1990). The leader's new work: Building learning organizations. *Sloan Management Review, 32*(1), 7-23.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1995). *The principalship: A reflective-practice perspective* (3rd ed.). Needham, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. (1988). *Supervision: Human perspectives* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Simon, Y. R. (1951/1993). *Philosophy of democratic government*. Notre Dame, IN: The University of Notre Dame Press.

Starratt, R. J. (1993). Staff development, supervision and appraisal. In *Transforming life in schools: Conversations about leadership and school renewal* (Chapter Ten, pp. 83-97). Hawthorn, Victoria, Australia: Australian Council for Educational Administration.

Sternberg, R. J., & Horvath, J. A. (1995, August-September). A prototype view of expert teaching. *Educational Researcher, 24*(6), 9-17.

Tiezzi, L. J. (1991). *Influences of a professional development institution on teachers' learning about teaching reading to Chapter I students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.

Terry, P. M. (1997). The principal and instructional leadership. In L. Wildman (Ed.), *School administration: The new knowledge base* (pp. 220-229). Lancaster, PA: Technomic Publishing Company.

Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Principles of curriculum and instruction*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Vaill, P. B. (1986). The purposing of high-performing systems. In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. E. Corbally (Eds.), *Leadership and organizational culture* (pp. 89-104). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Vygotsky, L. C. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Watzlawick, P., Beavin, J. H., & Jackson, D. D. (1967). *Pragmatics of human communication*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Weber, M. (1930/1992). *The Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism* (A. Giddens, Trans.). New York: Routledge.

Wildman, L. (1991). *Does the doctorate make a difference?* (ERIC ED 336 827). Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Wildman, L. (Ed.). (1997) *School administration: The new knowledge base*. Lancaster, PA: Technomic Publishing Company.